

*Chen*

20 May 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting with Senate Select Committee Staff on  
the IC Staff Reorganization

25X1 We met with six or seven of the Staff, under the general direction  
of Chip Pickett [redacted]

Chip indicated that I could expect to receive some questions on

- o overall personnel policies

- o the question of tight versus loose financial controls and  
the division of responsibility between us and the agencies.

STAT [redacted] sketched out his operation and the prospects for a  
budget execution group. In response to this, we were asked how we  
related to something like the GDIP program office. This prompted  
Chip to observe that we would face the general question of how do  
we fit in?

Another general question is what is the relation between the  
number of supervisors and the number of people actually producing  
intelligence. Aren't we threatening micromanagement?

In the discussion of OPEI we had to defend the evaluation  
function fairly extensively. Danny asked, "Given that the track  
record of the evaluation group is so mixed, why make it go through  
a wrenching change?" Chip observed, "Applying quantitative tools to  
intelligence questions hasn't worked very well in the past. What's  
promising now?"

What tasks do we specifically envision. In response to that Rod  
offered the mission analyses and those received a favorable reception.

When asked to explain the difference between SAND and PAID, Rod  
explained in the following way:

SAND would be

- o the staff around which cross program issue papers  
would be structured

- o a source of independent analysis of major new systems

- o a staff that would ask the question are assessments of  
tactical uses done right.

SUBJECT: Meeting with Senate Select Committee Staff on the  
IC Staff Reorganization

PAID would be

- o a group that would focus on mission analyses and
- o a group that would handle things like space policy and other issues.


Staffer named Angelo asked about the 5-year plan from proving analysis and where is the overall DCI perspective in doing it? He wanted to know if part of the evaluation job hadn't been passed to NFAC and if so how many billets had gone with it.

During the OPP presentation, it was suggested that we might be prepared to give an example a PRC(I) requirement that might not be high on DCID 1/2 but should be high on resource requirements.

In the discussion of OCIS it was asked whether we would issue ADP planning guidance and how we would relate generally to ADP systems choices.


They also wanted to know how many people would be upgraded as a result of the reorganization.

At the end Danny asked if the offices could layout a series of tasks and array the positions along side them. We agreed to provide the information.



STAT

Distribution:  
Orig. - D/DCI/RM  
1 - D/QPBD  
1 - D/OPEI  
1 - D/OCIS  
1 - Acting D/QPP  
1 - C/SS/ICS  
1 - RMS Registry

D/DCI/RM   
(20 May 1978)

STAT